

# PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

June 6, 2001

## CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Vlad Voytilla called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive.

## ROLL CALL:

Present were Chairman Vlad Voytilla, Planning Commissioners Gary Bliss, Brian Lynott and Dan Maks. Planning Commissioners Bob Barnard, Chuck Heckman and Eric Johansen were excused.

Principal Planner Hal Bergsma, Senior Planner Barbara Fryer, Assistant City Attorney Ted Naemura and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Voytilla, who presented the format for the meeting.

## VISITORS:

Chairman Voytilla asked if there were any visitors in the audience wishing to address the Commission on any non-agenda issue or item. There were none.

## STAFF COMMUNICATION:

Observing that Commissioner Chuck Heckman's resignation from the Planning Commission has made it necessary to appoint a new Planning Commissioner, Senior Planner Barbara Fryer mentioned that it would also be necessary to fill his vacant position on the Historic Resource Review Committee.

## OLD BUSINESS:

Chairman Voytilla opened the Public Hearing and read the format for Public Hearings. There were no disqualifications of the Planning Commission members. No one in the audience challenged the right of any Commissioner to hear any of the agenda items, to participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda. There was no response.

1                   **CONTINUANCES:**

2

3           A.       **CPA 99-00025 – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT**

4           The Planning Commission recommended approval of the proposed  
5           amendment to the Land Use Element text and Comprehensive Plan Land Use  
6           Map on November 29, 2000, after a series of hearings. On March 5, 2001,  
7           staff requested City Council to remand portions of the proposal back to the  
8           Planning Commission for reconsideration. The Planning Commission  
9           expanded consideration of Remand Area 7 to include two new parcels  
10          (1S116BB02700 and 1S116BB03100) in addition to 1S116BB0300. Notice  
11          was provided to the adjacent property owners of a new hearing regarding the  
12          Station Community Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designation on these three  
13          parcels approved through the South Tektronix Station Community Planning  
14          Process. The Planning Commission will consider whether to recommend  
15          application of the Corridor designation to these properties. The Corridor  
16          designation can be implemented through several zones, including General  
17          Commercial and Office Commercial.

18

19          Ms. Fryer mentioned that this particular amendment has been before the  
20          Planning Commission on several occasions, most recently on April 18, 2001,  
21          when Remand Areas Nos. 1 through 7 had been reviewed. Observing that the  
22          Commission had taken action on Remand Area No. 1, she noted that Remand  
23          Area No. 7 had been discussed and that due to their potential proximity to the  
24          light rail station, it had been determined that two additional parcels could  
25          benefit from the Corridor designation.

26

27          Ms. Fryer mentioned that additional notice had been provided to those  
28          additional parcels and that tonight's hearing involves several areas, including  
29          Remand Area No. 2, which consists of four parcels in the northern area of the  
30          City of Beaverton between Cornell Road and Science Park Drive. She  
31          pointed out that staff recommends a change from the current School/Parks  
32          land use designation to Town Center.

33

34          Ms. Fryer discussed Remand Area No. 3, noting that this consists of thirteen  
35          parcels that are designated Commercial, although staff proposes that these  
36          parcels be re-designated as Regional Center. She referred to a communication  
37          from the *Beaverton School District* regarding their land-locked property  
38          within this area, noting that staff had determined that the proposed Regional  
39          Center designation might not be appropriate. She mentioned that staff has  
40          recommended applying the Industrial designation to those particular  
41          properties due to their current use as storage facilities, with the remaining  
42          properties to be designated as Regional Center.

43

44          Referring to Remand Area Nos. 4 and 5, Ms. Fryer commented that these  
45          consist of areas that have been identified as Corridor. She mentioned that  
46          Remand Area No. 4 includes ten vacant and redevelopable single-family lots

1 and should be designated as Corridor, and that Remand Area No. 5 has been  
2 determined to be more appropriately designated as Neighborhood Residential  
3 – Standard Density.  
4

5 Ms. Fryer discussed Remand Area No. 6, which consists of 66 parcels that are  
6 currently designated as Urban Standard Density Residential, adding that staff  
7 is recommending that these parcels be changed to Corridor.  
8

9 Ms. Fryer referred to Remand Area No. 7, observing that based on the fact  
10 that the two additional tax lots are located between 1/3 of a mile and 2/3's of a  
11 mile from the light rail station, staff is recommending that all three properties  
12 be designated as Corridor, rather than Station Community.  
13

14 Concluding, Ms. Fryer pointed out that the exhibits provide maps of the  
15 affected areas, as well as additional communications that have been submitted,  
16 and offered to respond to any questions or comments.  
17

18 Commissioner Maks requested further clarification of Remand Area No. 2.  
19

20 Ms. Fryer informed Commissioner Maks that staff recommends application of  
21 the Town Center designation to Remand Area No. 2, with a recommendation  
22 that staff return with a proposed Institutional or Quasi-Public zoning district  
23 for approval by the Planning Commission and City Council, to be applied to  
24 the publicly-owned properties in that area. She mentioned that a possible  
25 alternative could be a finding that the Sunset High School is unlikely to  
26 redevelop in the near planning horizon and that it is located on the fringe of  
27 the Town Center and would not provide a good location for future  
28 development at greater intensities or densities. She further explained that this  
29 finding could include a recommendation to apply the Employment designation  
30 on the property, consistent with the properties located west and south of  
31 Science Park Drive. She mentioned that in the event of such findings, staff  
32 would retain their recommendation to apply the new Quasi-Public or  
33 Institutional zoning district once the district is developed.  
34

35 Chairman Voytilla questioned what Ms. Fryer's projection is for timing,  
36 specifically when this new district might become available.  
37

38 Ms. Fryer advised Chairman Voytilla that staff is currently working on this  
39 issue, noting that she had attended a meeting today during which the various  
40 uses were reviewed. She pointed out that she anticipates that this new  
41 designation could come forward within the next month.  
42

43 Commissioner Maks referred to Remand Area No. 4, specifically north of  
44 Hart Road and east of Murray Boulevard, requesting a more specific  
45 identification of Remand Area No. 4.  
46

1 Ms. Fryer informed Commissioner Maks that the current land use designation  
2 for this area is Neighborhood Standard Density Residential, adding that the  
3 current zoning designation is R-7 and that the area is proposed to be  
4 redesignated as Corridor, in which General Commercial, Convenience  
5 Commercial, Office Commercial, Community Service, Neighborhood Service,  
6 R-1, R-2, R-3.5 and R-4 zoning districts would be allowed with only a zoning  
7 map amendment.

8  
9 Commissioner Maks requested further clarification of changes to Remand  
10 Area No. 5.

11  
12 Ms. Fryer commented that staff is recommending that the land use designation  
13 of Urban Standard Density Residential in Remand Area No. 5 be changed to  
14 the new designation of Neighborhood Residential Standard Density, observing  
15 that they had originally requested Corridor.

16  
17 Commissioner Maks requested further clarification of Remand Area No. 6.

18  
19 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Maks the current land use designation for  
20 Remand Area No. 6 is Urban Standard Density Residential, adding that staff is  
21 recommending that this designation be changed to Corridor.

22  
23 Commissioner Maks mentioned Remand Area No. 7.

24  
25 Ms. Fryer pointed out that map for Remand Area No. 7 does not include the  
26 two additional parcels.

27  
28 Commissioner Maks questioned whether the Sterling Point area is actually  
29 zoned R-5.

30  
31 Ms. Fryer advised that the Sterling Point area is part of a Planned Unit  
32 Development (PUD).

33  
34 **PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

35  
36 On question, no member of the public appeared to testify regarding this  
37 application.

38  
39 On question, Ms. Fryer indicated that she had no additional comments  
40 regarding this application.

41  
42 On question, Assistant City Attorney Ted Naemura indicated that he had no  
43 comments regarding this application.

44  
45 The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.  
46

1 With regard to Remand Area No. 2, Commissioner Maks pointed out that he  
2 prefers the alternate staff recommendation of an Employment designation,  
3 adding that he prefers not to take action in anticipation of events that might  
4 occur at a later time. Chairman Voytilla and Commissioners Lynott and Bliss  
5 expressed their agreement with Commissioner Maks' rationale and preference  
6 for staff's alternate recommendation.  
7

8 With regard to Remand Area No. 3, Chairman Voytilla and Commissioners  
9 Maks, Lynott and Bliss expressed their agreement with staff's  
10 recommendation.  
11

12 With regard to Remand Area No. 4, Commissioner Maks pointed out that he  
13 has problems with 70% of the zoning districts, specifically some of the uses  
14 that could potentially overlay. He expressed his opinion that while this  
15 designation should be changed from R-7, it should not be designated as R-5.  
16 Emphasizing his concern with some of the potential uses, he expressed his  
17 support of staff's recommendation, adding that his concern with potential uses  
18 could be addressed at a later date. Chairman Voytilla concurred with  
19 Commissioner Maks, adding that he also shares his concerns with potential  
20 uses. Commissioners Lynott and Bliss expressed their support of Remand  
21 Area No. 4.  
22

23 With regard to Remand Area No. 5, Chairman Voytilla and Commissioners  
24 Maks, Lynott and Bliss expressed their support.  
25

26 With regard to Remand Area No. 6, Chairman Voytilla and Commissioner  
27 Maks expressed their support, adding that they have some concerns with the  
28 zoning districts. Commissioners Lynott and Bliss expressed their support of  
29 Remand Area No. 6.  
30

31 With regard to Remand Area No. 7, Chairman Voytilla and Commissioners  
32 Maks, Lynott and Bliss expressed their support.  
33

34 Commissioner Maks **MOVED** and Commissioner Lynott **SECONDED** a  
35 motion that CPA 99-00025 – Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element be  
36 approved, with the Comprehensive Plan Amendments made in Remand Area  
37 Nos. 3 through 7, as identified in the Supplemental Staff Report dated May  
38 30, 2001, and that with regard to Remand Area No. 2, staff be instructed to  
39 draft findings reflecting that because the Planning Commission feels that the  
40 properties are unlikely to develop in the planning horizon, and because they  
41 are located on the fringe of the Town Center, they would not make a good  
42 location for future development at greater intensities or densities, they should  
43 be designated Employment, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits  
44 presented during the Public Hearing on the matter and upon the background  
45 facts, findings and conclusions and based upon this Public Hearing.  
46

1 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

2  
3 **NEW BUSINESS:**

4  
5 **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

6  
7 **A. MERLO STATION AREA PLAN AMENDMENTS**

- 8  
9 1. **CPA 2001-0011** consists of a proposal to change the designation on the  
10 Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map embodied within CPA 99-00025 from  
11 Station Community to Industrial on the portion of tax lot 1S108BA00100  
12 that was formerly known as tax lot 1S105CC0046.
- 13  
14 2. **CPA 2001-0012** consists of a Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment to  
15 add the Merlo Station Area Community Plan to Volume V of the  
16 Comprehensive Plan as embodied within CPA 99-00025, adopt a land use  
17 map depicting three sub areas, and recommend changes to the City's and  
18 County's Transportation Systems Plans.
- 19  
20 3. **TA 2001-0006** consists of amendments to the City's Development Code in  
21 Chapter 20, Section 20, to:
- 22  
23 a. Add a new Station Community-Employment zoning district;  
24 b. Add applicable Site Development Requirements;  
25 c. Modify or add applicable Supplementary Regulations, including  
26 addition of a Major Pedestrian Route Map for the Merlo Station  
27 Area;  
28 d. Potentially add information related to Natural Resource  
29 Protection and Enhancement; and  
30 e. Potentially add information related to the Expansion and  
31 Enlargement of Nonconforming Uses with respect to the Merlo  
32 Station Area.
- 33  
34 4. **RZ 2001-0013** consists of a proposal to change the zoning on thirteen  
35 properties from Light Industrial to the new zoning district proposed under  
36 TA 2001-0006 of Station Community Employment. The thirteen  
37 properties are referenced in the following list:

38  
39 1S107AA00200      1S107AA00700      1S108BB00500  
40 1S107AA00300      1S107AA00800      1S108BB00700  
41 1S107AA00400      1S108BB00100      1S108BB00800  
42 1S107AA00500      1S108BB00400      1S1080002500  
43 1S107AA00600  
44

45 Ms. Fryer presented the Merlo Station Area Plan, adding that this includes the  
46 findings of Phase 1, consisting of Technical Reports 1, 2 and 3. She observed that

1 this particular proposal is in compliance with the recommendations of the  
2 Planning Commission, noting that staff had met with several stakeholders over the  
3 course of the project and that two of these stakeholders had provided comments.  
4 Observing that one of the stakeholders had expressed some concerns, she pointed  
5 out that these concerns had been addressed and are reflected in the handout  
6 regarding the new Development Code text. She referred to a communication  
7 from the *Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District*, indicating that they concur  
8 with staff's recommendations to date. She mentioned that tonight's presentation  
9 would include some of the finer points of the proposal, along with some  
10 discussion and hopefully direction for changes to the Development Code, adding  
11 that staff would like the Public Hearing to be continued until June 20, 2001.  
12

13 Ms. Fryer observed that one of the four items to be considered at this time is the  
14 Comprehensive Plan Amendment on one property from Station Community (SC)  
15 to Light Industrial (LI), adding that since this was included in the original  
16 proposal, the property has been sold from *Portland General Electric* (PGE) to  
17 *Reser's Foods* and is currently developed as a portion of their parking lot. She  
18 pointed out that staff proposes to add a community plan to Volume V of the  
19 Comprehensive Plan, which she referred to as the Merlo Station Area Plan, as  
20 well as amend the zoning map amendments to change the zoning district from LI  
21 to the Station Community Employment zone on all the properties within the  
22 Merlo Station Area Plan, with the exception of the one small triangle that they  
23 had proposed to change the Comprehensive Plan Amendment from SC to LI. She  
24 mentioned that Development Code amendments would implement that Station  
25 Community Employment zone.  
26

27 Ms. Fryer discussed the two packets that had been distributed, observing that  
28 these primarily address changes that had been made in response to comments  
29 received at the Work Session between staff and the Planning Commission. She  
30 introduced the primary consultants for the project, Ed Murphy of *Ed Murphy and*  
31 *Associates* and Bob Yakas, who is the architect and designer, adding that they  
32 intend to provide a brief presentation.  
33

34 **ED MURPHY**, representing *Ed Murphy and Associates*, provided a brief slide  
35 presentation of the Merlo Station Area Plan illustrating suggestions for fairly  
36 significant changes of the zoning from mostly Light Industrial types of uses while  
37 still recognizing the existing uses. He mentioned that this proposal is a  
38 Transportation Growth Management (TGM) Funded Project, observing that Phase  
39 1 consisted of Technical Report Nos. 1 through 3, adding that Phase 2 includes  
40 Comprehensive Plan Amendments, Development Code Amendments and Zoning  
41 Map Amendments. Referring to an illustration of the area, he pointed out  
42 property belonging to *Tri-Met*, *Beaverton School District*, *Verizon* and *Antcil*.  
43

44 Mr. Murphy mentioned that the land use plan involves several different aspects,  
45 including goals, policies and actions; permitted, conditional and prohibited land  
46 uses; development standards; and review procedures. He noted that the first

1 action would involve a Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment from SC to LI,  
2 adding that this pertains to 1.4 acres, which he referred to on an illustration.

3  
4 Mr. Murphy discussed the Community Plan, noting that this plan is separated into  
5 three sub areas, which he referred to on an illustration, as follows: 1) Sub Area  
6 No. 1 – Station Community Employment (0.5 Minimum FAR); 2) Sub Area No. 2  
7 – Station Area Employment (0.35 Minimum FAR); and 3) Sub Area No. 3 –  
8 Station Community Light Industrial (No Minimum FAR).

9  
10 Referring to the Transportation aspect of the project, Mr. Murphy discussed Local  
11 Access Streets and Transportation Planning Rule Compliance and provided an  
12 illustration of the transportation circulation concept map.

13  
14 Ms. Fryer emphasized that these access points would be subject to an access  
15 management plan prior to approval of the detailed points, adding that they are  
16 more conceptual than the exact drawings.

17  
18 Mr. Murphy referred to a pedestrian walkway between the street access points and  
19 pointed out a proposed trail. He mentioned that the Comprehensive Plan  
20 Amendment Analysis meets the Statewide Planning Goals and is consistent with  
21 RUGGO and the Framework Plan, the Comprehensive Plan of Beaverton and  
22 other local plans. He pointed out that the potential effect of the plan would not be  
23 detrimental to the quality of life, adding that the benefits offset the potential  
24 adverse impacts and satisfy the public need.

25  
26 Mr. Murphy discussed the environmental aspect of the plan, including  
27 performance standards, building setbacks next to residential zones and the Palmer  
28 Street Right-of-Way, which he pointed out on an illustration. He mentioned that  
29 some of the performance standards include vibration and odors not traveling  
30 beyond a property line, limiting heat and glare, and limited outdoor noise, which  
31 should not exceed 55 decibels (drive through standard). He discussed the special  
32 setbacks for side yards and rear yards, which equal a residential rear yard if a  
33 residence is allowed on adjacent property, adding that a height limit has been  
34 established to be the maximum height of any adjoining residential zone within  
35 100 feet of the property line.

36  
37 Observing that with the exception of a small portion that has been excluded, Mr.  
38 Murphy stated that the entire area would be rezoned from LI to Station  
39 Community Employment. He pointed out that this includes three Sub Areas  
40 within one zone, and provided an illustration of the permitted uses and  
41 development standards in the three Sub Areas, as follows:

42  
43 **SUB AREAS 1 AND 2**

43 **SUB AREA 3**

44  
45 **PERMITTED LAND USES**

45 **PERMITTED LAND USES**

46 Offices

Permitted Uses in Sub Areas 1 & 2



Child Care	Storage Yards
Research Facilities	Public Services or Utility Uses
Service Businesses	
Retail Trade	
Printing < 5000 Square Feet	
Clinics	
Manufacturing	
Financial Institutions	
Existing Single Family Dwellings	
Eating & Drinking Establishments	
Motels, Hotels & Extended Stay Hotels	

#### **CONDITIONAL LAND USES**

Parking as the Principal Use  
 Places of Worship  
 Educational Institutions  
 Commercial Schools  
 Social or Fraternal Organizations  
 Utility Installations  
 Printing > 5000 Square Feet

#### **CONDITIONAL LAND USES**

Facilities Related to Utility  
 Distribution  
 Educational Institutions  
 Commercial Schools

#### **PROHIBITED LAND USES IN SUB AREAS 1 -- 3**

New Residential Dwellings  
 Auto and Machinery Sales/Service  
 Car Washes  
 Junk Yards & Other Types of Storage, Solid Waste Transfer Station  
 Motels  
 Retail Lumber Yards  
 Bulk Retail, Fuel and Storage Yards  
 Cemeteries, Golf Courses & Commercial Indoor/Outdoor Recreation,  
 RV Parks, Theaters  
 Concrete Mixing & Asphalt Batch Plants, Electrical Power Generators,  
 Warehouses, Truck Stops, Printing, Nurseries  
 Furniture & Appliance Stores & Building Materials Centers > 10,000  
 Square Feet (Sub Areas 1 & 2 Only)  
 Kennels (Sub Area 3 Excludes Those Accessory to Veterinary Clinics or  
 Research Facilities)  
 Railroad Tracks and Facilities Such As Switching Yards, Spur or Holding  
 Tracks, Freight Depots & Surface Parking As the Primary Use

Mr. Murphy described the Development Standards in all three Sub Areas, with regard to minimum and maximum height, minimum and maximum FAR, Pedestrian Street and Performance Standards.

Observing that there should be travel options other than private automobile, Mr. Murphy mentioned bicycling, walking or riding the bus or the train.

1 Mr. Murphy discussed recommended actions for achieving the desired goals, as  
2 follows:

3  
4 *Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan:*

- 5 • CPA 2001-0011 (Reser's); and
- 6 • CPA 2001-0012 (Merlo Station Community Plan).

7  
8 *Proposed Amendments to the Development Code and Zoning:*

- 9 • TA 2001-0006 (New Zoning Districts & Standards); and
- 10 • RZ 2001-0013 (Rezone from LI to SC-E)

11  
12 Commissioner Maks referred to the road connection off of Merlo Road to SW  
13 Augusta Lane, requesting clarification of whether this travels through *Beaverton*  
14 *School District* property.

15  
16 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Maks that this road connection does involve  
17 school district property, adding that in the stakeholder meetings, the Facilities  
18 Manager, Mr. Maloney, had expressed a desire to realign Augusta Lane to match  
19 up with whatever driveway. She noted that with surplus property in front of the  
20 school, this would provide a benefit to the school district, adding that this  
21 particular alignment would not occur until after the preparation of an Access  
22 Management Plan.

23  
24 Commissioner Maks referred to page 8 of the Memorandum from *Ed Murphy &*  
25 *Associates*, specifically 6.2.2 Goal Balance Transportation System, requesting  
26 clarification of how an eight-foot, rather than six-foot sidewalk on this five-lane  
27 arterial street would be considered pedestrian-friendly. He emphasized that  
28 freight trucks would be traveling on this street.

29  
30 **ROBERT YAKAS** identified himself as a member of the consultant team and  
31 addressed the notion of pedestrian oriented development, and described this eight-  
32 foot sidewalk as a recommendation only, in an attempt to encourage a depth of  
33 sidewalk that is slightly friendlier than a six-foot sidewalk at the curbside. He  
34 mentioned that this provides an opportunity for a different standard, possibly a  
35 property line sidewalk, pointing out that the notion is to relinquish to the  
36 pedestrian as much of the right-of-way as possible. He noted that the County  
37 standard provides for a curbside sidewalk, adding that such a sidewalk generally  
38 includes utilities in the right-of-way as well, which reduces a six-foot sidewalk to  
39 3-1/2 feet, as opposed to 5-1/2 feet on an eight-foot sidewalk.

40  
41 Commissioner Maks questioned the planned width of 170<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and was  
42 advised by Mr. Murphy that 170<sup>th</sup> Avenue would be five lanes.

43  
44 Commissioner Maks agreed that an eight-foot sidewalk is not very wide from a  
45 pedestrian viewpoint, particularly as density increases, adding that he is aware of  
46 a transit mall that provides ten-foot and twelve-foot sidewalks. He pointed out

1 that a narrow sidewalk has a tendency not to work when a large amount of people  
2 are waiting for a bus, particularly with the addition of newspaper stands and bus  
3 shelters.

4  
5 Ms. Fryer noted that Washington County is supportive of an alternative standard  
6 for the sidewalks in this area.

7  
8 Ms. Fryer referred to page 6 of the Merlo Station Community Plan in the  
9 submittal dated May 30, 2001, specifically Community Plan Goal 4. She  
10 observed that staff had made revisions so that Action 1 -- Prepare and Access  
11 Management Plan for SW Merlo Road and SW 170<sup>th</sup> Avenue -- would be in  
12 compliance with both the City of Beaverton and Washington County's  
13 regulations. Referring to a graphic illustration, she noted that this would justify  
14 the access points identified in the Merlo Station Area Plan Technical Reports as  
15 shown on Transportation Circulation Concept Plan Figure 2. She mentioned that  
16 the next action has been modified as well, observing that it calls for the  
17 incorporation of the local street plan justified under Action 1 into the City of  
18 Beaverton's Transportation System Plan. She pointed out that once an Access  
19 Management Plan has been prepared and approved by both the County and the  
20 City, adoption into the Transportation System Plan would occur. She noted that  
21 an attempt would also be made to influence the County Transportation System  
22 Plan.

23  
24 Referring to pages 11 and 12 of the of the Merlo Station Community Plan,  
25 Commissioner Maks mentioned that this document indicates that 170<sup>th</sup> Avenue is  
26 truck-friendly, which might conflict with the desire to develop a pedestrian-  
27 friendly and bicycle-friendly area near the light rail station. He referred to the  
28 comment that 170<sup>th</sup> Avenue is a major arterial connecting Farmington Road and  
29 US Highway 26 and serves a high school and efforts should be made to make this  
30 route more pedestrian-friendly and bicycle-friendly, emphasizing that the majority  
31 of the students in this options high school arrive by private vehicles.

32  
33 Mr. Yakas noted that some of these students utilize public transportation.

34  
35 Commissioner Maks advised Mr. Yakas that a very small portion of the students  
36 attending this option high school arrive by public transportation, pointing out that  
37 this school serves the entire school district.

38  
39 Mr. Yakas pointed out that sidewalks would be necessary if this route is intended  
40 to serve pedestrians.

41  
42 Commissioner Maks requested clarification of the situation regarding printing and  
43 publishing establishments.

44

1 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Maks that based on the comments provided by  
2 the Planning Commissioners, printing and publishing establishments would be  
3 subject to additional use restrictions.  
4

5 Referring to Prohibited Uses, Sub-Area 3, specifically Item No. 33,  
6 Commissioner Maks discussed other uses which, in the determination of the  
7 Planning Director, are non-transit-supportive and do not meet the intent and  
8 purpose of the Station Community-Employment District as stated in the  
9 Comprehensive Plan.  
10

11 Commissioner Maks commented that he had understood that hotels and extended  
12 stay hotels would be considered a conditional use, rather than an outright use.  
13

14 Observing that this is a staff error, Ms. Fryer informed Commissioner Maks that  
15 hotels and extended stay hotels would be considered a conditional use.  
16

17 Chairman Voytilla mentioned that in order to provide services to a variety of  
18 groups, hotels frequently require conference and meeting spaces, questioning  
19 whether this would be considered an allowed use.  
20

21 Ms. Fryer noted that conference and meeting spaces has not been included with  
22 hotels.  
23

24 Chairman Voytilla pointed out that most individuals who utilize these facilities  
25 arrive by private vehicles, observing that this could create a parking issue.  
26

27 Ms. Fryer noted that structured parking is a permitted use in this area, adding that  
28 she would provide appropriate language to ensure that the conference centers and  
29 meeting rooms have adequate parking available.  
30

31 Commissioner Maks referred to page LU-3, questioning whether No. 7 had been  
32 added.  
33

34 Advising Commissioner Maks that No. 7 had been added, Ms. Fryer pointed out  
35 that while this originally involved utility installations other than transmission lines  
36 for Areas 1 and 2, Area 3 provides for utilities relating to utility distribution such  
37 as substations, water towers, pump stations and utility installations,  
38 recommending that these be combined.  
39

40 Commissioner Maks referred to the generic question regarding furniture and  
41 building materials, requested clarification of whether this is permitted in Areas 1  
42 and 2.  
43

44 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Maks that furniture and building materials are  
45 actually prohibited in Areas 1 and 2, adding that Nos. 2 and 13 are allowed in  
46 Sub-Areas 1 and 2 but not referenced at all in Sub-Area 3. She questioned

1 whether the Planning Commission desires to reference this in No. 1, specifically  
2 whether to permit, prohibit or conditionally permit this use.

3  
4 Commissioner Maks requested clarification of why furniture and building  
5 materials should be allowed up to 10,000 square feet, observing that no residential  
6 use is intended in this area, and requested a definition of an *Ace Hardware Store*.

7  
8 Ms. Fryer described an *Ace Hardware Store* as a building materials sales and  
9 supplies hardware store of less than 10,000 square feet.

10  
11 Commissioner Maks suggested that while an *Ace Hardware Store* might be  
12 desirable in this area, 10,000 square feet is excessive, adding that an appropriate  
13 store of this type, possibly 5,000 square feet, could serve to enhance the adjoining  
14 property and fulfill a need.

15  
16 Chairman Voytilla observed that the *Falk Hardware Store* is small, but efficient.

17  
18 Commissioner Maks questioned whether there would be a use for a furniture  
19 and/or appliance store within this area, and requested clarification of whether an  
20 office rental furniture establishment would be a permitted use.

21  
22 Ms. Fryer observed that an office rental furniture establishment would be  
23 permitted under the furniture and appliance store use.

24  
25 Commissioner Maks mentioned that a furniture and appliance store use is  
26 currently prohibited, suggesting that while this use should be allowed  
27 conditionally in all three areas, 5,000 square feet is a good-sized store while  
28 10,000 square feet is excessive.

29  
30 Chairman Voytilla pointed out that items are generally on display outside of these  
31 stores, providing additional storage space.

32  
33 Commissioner Maks emphasized that outdoor storage should not be permitted.

34  
35 Chairman Voytilla noted that he is referring to outdoor display, rather than  
36 outdoor storage.

37  
38 Commissioner Maks requested clarification of whether *Ace Hardware Store* is  
39 retail or building materials.

40  
41 Ms. Fryer informed Commissioner Maks that *Ace Hardware Store* is a mixed use.

42  
43 Commissioner Maks expressed his opinion that a hardware store should require a  
44 Conditional Use Permit, reiterating that up to 10,000 square feet is excessive.  
45

1 Observing that this Public Hearing would be continued, Chairman Voytilla  
2 suggested that staff should determine the size of a typical neighborhood hardware  
3 store prior to the date scheduled for the continuance.  
4

5 Ms. Fryer requested clarification of whether a hardware store should require a  
6 CUP in all three areas.  
7

8 Commissioner Maks expressed his opinion that a hardware store should require a  
9 CUP in all three areas, and again requested clarification of why a 9,000 square  
10 foot furniture store should be an allowed use in this area.  
11

12 Chairman Voytilla noted that under offices and professional service businesses,  
13 there are restrictions for the operation of a professional interior decorator service  
14 that also sells furniture. He questioned whether the office size would be limited  
15 in order to allow for 5,000 square feet of showroom area in which furniture would  
16 be retailed.  
17

18 Emphasizing that he challenges the sale of furniture in this area, Commissioner  
19 Maks commented that this should only be allowed as a conditional use.  
20

21 Chairman Voytilla suggested that it is possible that this use could potentially be  
22 slipped in as a professional interior decorator and end up with such a facility.  
23

24 Mr. Yakas questioned whether Commissioner Maks feels that 5,000 square feet is  
25 also excessive for a hardware store.  
26

27 Commissioner Maks advised Mr. Yakas that a 5,000 square foot hardware store is  
28 adequate, emphasizing that this provides ample space for a large quantity of  
29 hardware.  
30

31 Ms. Fryer reminded Commissioner Maks that these zones would have greater  
32 application than just for the Merlo Station area, adding that staff is attempting to  
33 provide a zone similar to the existing County zone.  
34

35 Principal Planner Hal Bergsma clarified that the County has designated all the  
36 Nike and IBM (formerly Sequent) property between Jenkins Road, Walker Road  
37 and 158<sup>th</sup> Avenue as Transit Oriented-Employment (TO-EMP).  
38

39 Commissioner Maks emphasized that while there might be an appropriate need  
40 and use, a hardware store should not be allowed outright in this area, pointing out  
41 that this would defeat the purpose of the Comprehensive Plan. Referring to the  
42 public need, he requested that staff expand on the need for the citizens whom he  
43 represents to make this change.  
44

45 Ms. Fryer mentioned that the public has a \$1 Billion investment in the light rail.  
46

1 Commissioner Maks requested clarification of the rationale, specifically the need  
2 for the citizens of the City of Beaverton, for locating the light rail station at that  
3 particular site, adding that this site was determined as an afterthought, without  
4 consideration for any of these plans.

5  
6 Ms. Fryer expressed her opinion that the public need is there for the City of  
7 Beaverton to be in compliance with the Regional Framework Plan and the Urban  
8 Growth Management Functional Plan. She pointed out that it is necessary to zone  
9 a portion, if not all of this area, station community, emphasizing that an increased  
10 density is necessary to allow the City's growth capacity numbers to be accounted  
11 for.

12  
13 Emphasizing that there is no requirement within the Regional Framework Plan to  
14 achieve this density in this particular fashion, Commissioner Maks pointed out  
15 that a Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) or Station Community is not  
16 necessary.

17  
18 Principal Planner Hal Bergsma stated that the Regional Urban Growth  
19 Management Functional Plan, as well as the Metro 2040 Growth Concept calls for  
20 an average density of 45 people per acre in a Station Community, adding that  
21 Town Center is only 40 people per acre. He expressed his opinion that the region  
22 looks to local governments to implement that concept by increasing densities in  
23 Station Communities, adding that this is what staff is attempting to achieve. He  
24 pointed out that whether this Station Community had been located through a  
25 logical process or as an afterthought, the fact is that it is there now.

26  
27 Commissioner Maks reiterated his question requesting clarification of where it is  
28 stipulated that this must be identified as a Station Community.

29  
30 Mr. Bergsma clarified that Title 1 of the Urban Growth Management Functional  
31 Plan indicates that local government is responsible to specifically define the  
32 boundaries of all of the design types that are identified on the 2040 Growth  
33 Concept Map, which identifies this area as Station Community.

34  
35 Commissioner Maks advised Mr. Bergsma that his question had been addressed,  
36 observing that the public need is not being driven for or by the citizens of  
37 Beaverton, but strictly by Metro, the 2040 Growth Concept and the Regional  
38 Framework Document.

39  
40 Mr. Murphy stated that in the interest of providing for more employees per acre,  
41 this designation is one that would best serve the interests of the City of Beaverton.

42  
43 Commissioner Maks responded that it is very seldom that he observes even a few  
44 citizens clamoring for what Mr. Murphy had just identified, adding that he fails to  
45 understand how this meets the needs of the citizenry.

46

1 Observing that it is rare for citizens to actually clamor for anything, Mr. Bergsma  
2 noted that there is an interest in creating more higher-paying jobs in this  
3 community. He mentioned that last year, in an effort to maximize the number of  
4 jobs per acre in the limited amount of industrial and employment land that is  
5 available in the City of Beaverton, the City Council had adopted an Economic  
6 Development Strategy. He emphasized that staff is attempting to take advantage  
7 of the opportunity that is available, in the terms of alternative transportation,  
8 providing for more jobs on a limited amount of industrial-type land.

9  
10 Commissioner Maks stressed the importance of being aware of what is being lost  
11 when such changes are made.

12  
13 Commissioner Bliss commented that he still has a problem with the sidewalks,  
14 pointing out that more impervious area is being created. He mentioned that Clean  
15 Water Services (CWS), formerly the Unified Sewerage Agency (USA), is  
16 attempting to diminish the impervious area. He expressed his opinion that no  
17 matter how wide the sidewalk is, Merlo Road is not pedestrian-friendly.

18  
19 Mr. Yakas reminded Commissioner Bliss that no set standard has yet been  
20 established for these sidewalks. He pointed out that the critical area is on the  
21 south side of the street, between the transit station and Merlo Road, adding that  
22 this is the area the pedestrians would utilize.

23  
24 Commissioner Maks expressed concern that these designations are being driven  
25 by Metro, rather than the City of Beaverton, adding that attempts are being made  
26 to make areas pedestrian-friendly where it is not appropriate and that there are  
27 other areas available that would be more appropriate.

28  
29 Mr. Murphy reminded Commissioner Maks that this station area involves a very  
30 long-range proposal over a twenty-year period of time, adding that it is  
31 anticipated that the Elmonica Station would develop at a higher density as well.  
32 He pointed out that the next twenty years might bring about a totally different  
33 transition, adding that it is beneficial not to eliminate other options that might  
34 become apparent at a later time.

35  
36 Mr. Bliss mentioned that from an employment perspective, Mr. Murphy had just  
37 removed 400 square feet per 100 feet of frontage, adding that there is some  
38 conflict of interest. Expressing his opinion that the issue is not being approached  
39 appropriately, he noted that he could see some merit to what is being done. He  
40 mentioned a proposed trail located on the north side of the LRT on the master  
41 plan, requesting clarification of how people would get across the wetlands.

42  
43 Ms. Fryer advised Mr. Bliss that staff had anticipated the construction of a bridge  
44 or an elevated structure.

45



1 Mr. Bliss pointed out that the City of Beaverton is currently in the process of  
2 constructing a pedestrian crossing of Fanno Creek at the Greenwood Inn,  
3 emphasizing that the cost is over \$900,000 for a simple pedestrian bridge, which  
4 he feels is an inappropriate use of public funds. He suggested that because the  
5 bridge or elevated structure mentioned by Ms. Fryer could easily exceed the  
6 amount he had just referred to, someone should review the issue to determine  
7 whether this proposal is even feasible.

8  
9 Mr. Yakas pointed out that the elevated platforms are not nearly as expensive as  
10 the pedestrian bridges.

11  
12 Mr. Bliss observed that he could support such a platform if it is actually created  
13 for and utilized only by pedestrians, emphasizing that he is opposed to a multi-  
14 purpose use that would also allow for vehicles.

15  
16 For the benefit of Mr. Bliss, Ms. Fryer pointed out on the aerial photograph that  
17 the area north of the station has already been designated by Washington County  
18 as Transit-Oriented. She pointed out that neither *Reser's Foods* nor the *PGE*  
19 facility had been included in this process.

20  
21 Mr. Yakas pointed out that a large number of individuals actually exit the light  
22 rail at Merlo Station.

23  
24 Mr. Bergsma mentioned that the most immediate impact of this zone change  
25 would allow Tri-Met the utilization of the excess portion of their property for  
26 more transit-oriented purposes.

27  
28 Ms. Fryer commented that it is not feasible to have one small pocket of transit-  
29 oriented development.

30  
31 Chairman Voytilla requested a description of the appearance of Merlo Road with  
32 the eight-foot sidewalk from a pedestrian perspective, specifically that this eight  
33 feet might be beneficial to the types of development that might occur.

34  
35 Mr. Murphy described the standards that would apply in this area, specifically  
36 buildings located closer to the sidewalk than they would normally be in an office  
37 park, adding that there would be limitations on minimum and maximum heights  
38 for these buildings. He mentioned that the front yard setback would allow for  
39 some landscaping and possibly some hardscaping, possibly a plaza entering the  
40 building. He pointed out that the view would be similar to that of Evergreen  
41 Parkway in Hillsboro and some of the newer development in the Amber Glen and  
42 Tanasbourne areas.

43  
44 Chairman Voytilla observed that this would involve individual, possibly large-  
45 scale structures with one or more entrances, with perpendicular pedestrian access

1 off of this sidewalk, providing some focal interest point to encourage pedestrians  
2 to look at shops, offices or professional spaces.

3  
4 Mr. Murphy mentioned that the Development Code would include the opportunity  
5 for some retail use at the ground floor for a more pedestrian-friendly experience.

6  
7 Ms. Fryer commented that the major pedestrian routes are being applied with  
8 regulations that are currently a part of the Development Code, providing the same  
9 incentives, in terms of height and massing, to provide for the pedestrian  
10 experience.

11  
12 On question, Mr. Murphy assured Chairman Voytilla that there would be more  
13 interaction between the pedestrians and the architecture than is occurring at the  
14 facilities identified at Evergreen Parkway and that the utility undergrounding  
15 ordinance would ensure that utilities would not be a significant issue.

16  
17 Referring to the concept of pedestrian use of a walkway, Mr. Naemura pointed  
18 out that the two-foot difference between six feet and eight feet is quite significant  
19 and creates a more desirable pedestrian walkway.

20  
21 Mr. Yakas advised Mr. Naemura that while there is obviously a perceptual  
22 difference between walking on a curbside sidewalk and one located behind a  
23 planter strip, he is not certain of whether there is actually any means to document  
24 that this provides for an improved pedestrian experience. He pointed out that  
25 there are also alternatives to the curbside sidewalk, whether it is eight feet or six  
26 feet, usually with a planter strip between the roadway and the sidewalk. Noting  
27 that property is being removed from the development parcels, he commented that  
28 this also adds value to the development.

29  
30 Mr. Bliss emphasized that parking strips become ugly if they are not maintained.

31  
32 Mr. Yakas mentioned that it is more likely that this area would have tree wells,  
33 rather than parking strips, adding that while the wider sidewalk reduces the  
34 amount of developable land, the setback requirements are also being reduced  
35 significantly. He emphasized that with an eight-foot sidewalk, two people can  
36 actually walk side by side and pass two other people walking side by side, adding  
37 that this is not feasible with a six-foot sidewalk.

38  
39 Chairman Voytilla agreed that wider sidewalks do attract a greater number of  
40 pedestrians. Referring to the creek crossing on 170<sup>th</sup> Avenue, he questioned  
41 whether the adequacy of the wildlife connectivity would be maintained with the  
42 widening of 170<sup>th</sup> Avenue, specifically whether culverts would be provided.

43  
44 Ms. Fryer stated that in light of the current Endangered Species Act and the  
45 current curves on 170<sup>th</sup> Avenue, it is likely that the section across Beaverton  
46 Creek would include a very large open-end box culvert or a bridge.

1 Chairman Voytilla expressed concern that nothing specifically addresses this as a  
2 design standard or criteria and questioned whether this should be addressed.

3  
4 Ms. Fryer pointed out that this area is not particularly a part of the station area,  
5 adding that she is not certain when this facility would actually be built.

6  
7 Chairman Voytilla referred to the traffic signal proposed for Merlo Drive and  
8 Merlo Road traveling south, specifically the distance between the two  
9 intersections.

10  
11 Mr. Murphy advised Chairman Voytilla that the distance between the two  
12 intersections is 100 feet.

13  
14 Chairman Voytilla questioned how the queuing works with this signal.

15  
16 Ms. Fryer reminded Chairman Voytilla that this connection of Merlo Drive and  
17 Merlo Road and the realignment of the school district's driveway is a current  
18 project that is going through development review at this time, with an associated  
19 traffic study to determine an appropriate location for this realignment. She  
20 emphasized that this distance is more conceptual and does not necessarily involve  
21 exactly 100 feet.

22  
23 Chairman Voytilla mentioned that he has concerns with the queuing at that light  
24 and the impact on that particular intersection. He questioned whether any of the  
25 current uses by current property owners would become non-conforming.

26  
27 Ms. Fryer mentioned that while the existing single-family dwellings would be  
28 allowed, no new single-family dwellings could be constructed in this area.

29  
30 Referring to the Supplemental Staff Report dated May 30, 2001, Chairman  
31 Voytilla mentioned that he has some questions regarding the standards for Design  
32 Review Conditions of Approval.

33  
34 Ms. Fryer informed Chairman Voytilla that these are the standard Conditions of  
35 Approval that staff generally starts with, clarifying that the phrase "screened from  
36 public view" is intended to require screening around air conditioning units and  
37 garbage collection units and that "public view" includes adjacent properties.

38  
39 On question, Commissioners Lynott and Bliss indicated that they had no further  
40 questions or comments.

41  
42 Commissioner Maks requested clarification of why staff is requesting a  
43 continuance of this Public Hearing.

44  
45 Ms. Fryer indicated that the Planning Commissioners had made some additional  
46 suggestions regarding these applications and that staff has requested an

1 opportunity to reformat the draft district to include the Station Community zones  
2 as they exist in the adopted Development Code. She requested that this Public  
3 Hearing be continue until June 20, 2001.

4  
5 Chairman Voytilla observed that the Public Hearing has not yet been opened.

6  
7 Ms. Fryer indicated that she expects to address the issues that had been raised this  
8 evening, eliminate the footnotes as requested by the Development Services staff,  
9 and to make certain that the uses are cited exactly the same in Sub-Areas 1, 2 and  
10 3.

11  
12 **PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

13  
14 On question, no member of the audience appeared to testify regarding these  
15 applications.

16  
17 Commissioner Maks **MOVED** and Commissioner Bliss **SECONDED** a motion  
18 to continue the Public Hearing for CPA 2001-0011, CPA 2001-0012, TA 2001-  
19 0006 and RZ 2001-0013 – Merlo Station Area Plan Amendments to a date certain  
20 of June 20, 2001.

21  
22 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

23  
24 Expressing his reluctance to accept Commissioner Heckman's resignation,  
25 Chairman Voytilla stated that the alternate, Russell Davis, would be filling this  
26 position, effective June 20, 2001. He requested that staff provide assistance in  
27 expressing proper recognition to Commissioner Heckman for his service to the  
28 City of Beaverton and the community.

29  
30 Commissioner Maks emphasized that it would be difficult to fill Commissioner  
31 Heckman's shoes.

32  
33 Mr. Naemura suggested that former Planning Commissioners who might have  
34 served with him should be notified of any event planned in recognition of  
35 Commissioner Heckman.

36  
37 Commissioner Maks mentioned that Commissioner Heckman's health should be  
38 considered when considering any activity in recognition of his service.

39  
40 Chairman Voytilla agreed that there are issues to consider and discuss prior to  
41 making any definite plans.

42  
43 Commissioner Maks expressed his opinion that the City of Beaverton is in a very  
44 sorry state when he is the senior member of the Planning Commission.

45

1 Chairman Voytilla commented that he is sorry to lose the benefit of  
2 Commissioner Heckman's Heckman, noting that it would be necessary to fill his  
3 vacant position on the Historic Resource Review Committee (HRRC) as well.  
4

5 Commissioner Maks mentioned that he had ended up with the responsibility of  
6 Code Review, expressing his opinion that the new code would eliminate the  
7 HRRC.  
8

9 Chairman Voytilla stated that any duty on the HRRC would be very limited.  
10

11 Observing that the HRRC has had only one meeting in the past two years, Ms.  
12 Fryer indicated that there would definitely be no more than two or three meetings  
13 throughout a period of one year.  
14

15 Commissioner Lynott volunteered to serve on the HRRC.  
16

17 Chairman Voytilla agreed that Commissioner Lynott would fill the vacant  
18 position on the HRRC.  
19

20 Chairman Voytilla advised staff that former Commissioner Heckman would like  
21 to continue to receive any mailings he is now receiving.  
22

23 Ms. Fryer assured Chairman Voytilla that the usual mailings would continue to be  
24 sent to Commissioner Heckman.  
25

26 Commissioner Maks pointed out that Commissioner Heckman would be sure to  
27 notify him any time he made an inappropriate decision.  
28

29 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**  
30

31 Minutes of the meeting of April 18, 2001, submitted. Chairman Voytilla  
32 requested that the minutes be amended to reflect that Commissioner Heckman  
33 was absent. Commissioner Bliss requested that the minutes be amended to reflect  
34 that he was absent. Commissioner Maks **MOVED** and Commissioner Lynott  
35 **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be approved as written and amended.  
36

37 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously, with the exception of Commissioner Bliss,  
38 who abstained from voting on this issue.  
39

40 Minutes of the meeting of April 25, 2001, submitted. Commissioner Maks  
41 **MOVED** and Commissioner Bliss **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be  
42 approved as written.  
43

44 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.  
45

1 Minutes of the meeting of May 2, 2001, submitted. Commissioner Bliss  
2 **MOVED** and Commissioner Maks **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be  
3 approved as written.  
4

5 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously, with the exception of Commissioner Lynott,  
6 who abstained from voting on this issue.  
7

8 Minutes of the meeting of May 9, 2001, submitted. At the request of Mr.  
9 Naemura, Commissioner Maks pointed out that line 37 of page 3 should be  
10 amended to include the "H" that is missing on Hillsdale. Commissioner Maks  
11 **MOVED** and Commissioner Bliss **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be  
12 approved as amended.  
13

14 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously, with the exception of Chairman Voytilla, who  
15 abstained from voting on this issue.  
16

17 Minutes of the workshop session of May 16, 2001, submitted. Commissioner  
18 Bliss requested that the headings be amended to reflect May 16, 2001, rather than  
19 May 9, 2001. Commissioner Bliss **MOVED** and Commissioner Lynott  
20 **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be approved as amended.  
21

22 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously, with the exception of Commissioner Maks,  
23 who abstained from voting on this issue.  
24

25 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**  
26

27 The meeting adjourned at 9:22 p.m.